

## REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application, of which claims 1-15 presently stand rejected. By the present Amendment, independent claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are amended. In view of the remarks that follow, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

## Interview

In the final office action mailed May 3, 2007, the claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,689,270 by *Kelley et al* in view of PCT international application no. WO009711384A1, to *Duffett-Smith et al*. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Kelley et al* and *Duffett-Smith et al* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,315 to *Freeburg et al*.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on October 1, 2007. During the interview, Attorney for Applicants discussed the benefits of the claimed invention and the disadvantages of the system disclosed in *Kelley et al* and similar systems as described, for example, on page 4, lines 11-25 of the application. None of the cited references discloses or suggests generating a combination of measurements received by plural receivers as claimed. The system disclosed in *Kelley et al* and similar systems use measurements of each fixed observer unit separately which adds an extra degree of uncertainty and therefore requires more measurements to overcome the unknown quantities. By contrast, the claimed invention combines offsets from plural receivers to allow for the creation of a virtual location measurement unit (VLMU) having a list of offsets relative to a common reference.

During the interview, the Examiner proposed amending claim 1 to recite a VLMU. Citing VLMU in the preamble of claim 1 and similarly in the preambles of the other independent claims 2, 8 and 9 was proposed. Attorney for Applicants stated that the VLMU was recited in the preambles of the independent claims using such claim language as "...generating a list of

offsets... of a plurality of transmission source signals, received at a given location, relative to a common reference...". Nonetheless, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 have been amended to more clearly state a VLMU in the preambles of the independent claims.

During the interview, the Examiner also requested a substitute specification and application data sheet indicating the inventor name, priority date and bibliographic information. The Attorney for Applicants respectfully directed the Examiner's attention to the Transmittal Letter to the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) Concerning a Filing Under 35 U.S.C. 371 filed and copy of the international application with the application which provide the inventor names, international application information, priority date and other bibliographic information. Applicants also request acknowledgement of the substitute specification submitted on February 6, 2007.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-15 is respectfully requested.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and would appreciate early notification of the same.

### ***Invitation for a telephone interview***

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 659-9076 if further issues remain with allowance of this case.

Serial No.: 09/830,447  
Amdt. dated October 3, 2007  
in reply to final Office Action mailed  
May 3, 2007


41253

***Deposit Account Authorization***

Although no fee is believed due by submission of this paper, authorization is hereby made to charge any fees due or outstanding, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **18-2220** (Order No. 41253).

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: October 3, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stacey J. Longanecker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 33,952

**Customer No. 01609**

ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, LLP  
Suite 600  
1300 19th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 659-9076  
(202) 659-9344 (Fax)